

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION EIGHT

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JAMAAL ANDREW  
McKINNEY

Defendant and Appellant.

B275209

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. YA093310)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Alan B. Honeycutt, Judge. Affirmed.

Ava R. Stralla, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

\* \* \* \* \*

Defendant Jamaal Andrew McKinney was charged by information with two counts of robbery (Pen. Code, § 211). Following the trial court's denial of defendant's motion to exclude statements made to police allegedly in violation of *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436 (*Miranda*), defendant entered a no contest plea to one robbery count, and the second count was dismissed. Defendant was sentenced to the high term of five years in prison. Defendant initially received a total of 418 days of custody credit. His custody credits were later corrected by the trial court, following appellate counsel's request for correction to reflect 425 days of total credit, consisting of 370 actual days and 55 days of conduct credit. Defendant was ordered to pay various fines and fees.

Defendant filed two notices of appeal. The first notice of appeal purported to appeal "denial of the defense *Miranda* motion" and requested issuance of a certificate of probable cause to appeal this issue. No certificate of probable cause appears in the appellate record. The second notice purported to appeal postplea matters not requiring a certificate of probable cause.

We appointed appellate counsel to represent defendant. Appointed counsel filed a brief in which no issues were raised. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*)). The brief included a declaration that counsel reviewed the record and sent a letter to defendant explaining her evaluation of the record. Counsel further declared that she advised defendant of his right, under *Wende*, to submit a supplemental brief. Defendant did not file a supplemental brief with this court.

The factual basis for the plea is as follows (as established at the preliminary hearing): On August 3, 2014, defendant and a cohort entered a Manhattan Beach jewelry store, smashed display cases with hammers, and absconded with \$300,000 in merchandise.

We have examined the entire record, consisting of two volumes of clerk's transcripts and one volume of a reporter's transcript, and are satisfied that appointed counsel fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable appellate issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106; *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.)

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

GRIMES, J.

WE CONCUR:

BIGELOW, P. J.

FLIER, J.